REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the claims 1-22 because the claims did not commence on a separate sheet. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.125, applicant has submitted a substitute specification which has claims commencing on a separate sheet. Applicant submits that the substitute specification does not contain any new matter.

Applicant notes that that the Office Action appeared to incorrectly list the claims that were rejected in paragraph 4, and paragraph 5 of the Office Action, since only claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 15-17, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Keohane et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0154837 in view of JP 11055304 (hereinafter JP '304).

Referring to independent claim 1, the claim recites in part:

"determining when a first web page is being closed or a second web page is being opened on a first computer, the first web page having an embedded software object therein; and,

in response to the first web page being closed or the second web page being opened, executing a software function in the embedded software object that both transmits a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object, and releases memory in the first computer associated with the embedded software object."

Referring to Keohane et al., the reference is directed to an apparatus for managing caching

of data on a client. However, after carefully reviewing Keohane et al., applicant submits that the reference does not provide any teaching of: "in response to the first web page being closed or the second web page being opened, executing a software function in the embedded software object that both transmits a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object, and releases memory in the first computer associated with the embedded software object", as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7, 8 and 17. In particular, applicant notes that Keohane et al. does not even mention a software function in an embedded software object that both sends messages and releases memory. Further, after carefully reviewing JP '304, applicant submits that JP '304 does not provide any teaching of the foregoing limitations of claim 1, and similarly recited limitations in independent claims 7, 8 and 17.

Because the combination of Keohane et al. and JP '304 does not teach each every limitation of independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 17, applicant submits that claims 1, 7, 8 and 17, and claims 2, 4, 5, 9-11, 15, 16, 19 and 22 which depend from one of claims 1, 7, 8 and 17, are allowable over these references.

Claims 3, 6, 12-14, 18, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Keohane et al. in view of JP '304 and further in view of Schlereth, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205197.

After carefully reviewing Keohane et al. and JP '304, applicant submits that the references do not provide any teaching of: "in response to the first web page being closed or the second web page being opened, executing a software function in the embedded software object that both transmits a first data message to a second computer instructing the second computer to stop sending predetermined information to the embedded software object, and releases memory in the first computer associated with the embedded software object", as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7, 8 and 17. Further, Schlereth does not provide any teaching of the foregoing limitations.

146887

Because the combination of Keohane et al., JP '304, and Schlereth does not teach each every limitation of independent claims 1, 7, 8 and 17, applicant submits that claims 3, 6, 12-14, 18, 20 and 21 which depend from one of claims 1, 7, 8, 17, are allowable over these references.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the presently submitted response, applicant's attorney respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention. If there are any additional charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____

John F. Buckert
Reg. No. 44,572
Telephone: (248) 524-2300 ext. 3109

Date: November 1, 2007